arXiv:astro-ph/9808117v1 12 Aug 1998

The Open Cluster NGC 7789: II. CCD VI Photometry

Munhwan Gim, Don A. VandenBerg

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Victoria,

Victoria, BC, V8W 3P6

Electronic mail: **gim@uvastro.phys.uvic.ca, davb@uvvm.uvic.ca**

Peter B. Stetson, James E. Hesser

National Research Council, Herzberg Institute of Astrophysics, Dominion Astrophysical Observatory 5071 West Saanich Road, Victoria, BC, V8X 4M6

Electronic mail: **firstname.lastname@hia.nrc.ca**

David R. Zurek[1]

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Victoria,

Victoria, BC, V8W 3P6

Received _____; accepted _____

[1]Present address: Space Telescope Science Institute, 3700 San Martin Drive, Baltimore, MD 21218. Electronic mail: **zurek@stsci.edu**

ABSTRACT

A $(V, V-I)$–diagram for the intermediate-age open cluster NGC 7789 has been derived from CCD observations of more than 15,000 stars within $\approx$ 18 arcmin of the cluster center. From the brightest giants and blue stragglers at $V \sim 11$ to the faintest lower main-sequence stars that were observed (at $V \sim 21$, $M_V \sim 9$), the C-M diagram is well defined. A prominent clump of core helium-burning stars is evident at $V = 13.0$ and the upper end of the main sequence shows a fairly pronounced curvature to the red, which is indicative of significant convective core overshooting. Indeed, comparisons with up-to-date stellar models show that it is not possible to explain the observed morphology in the vicinity of the turnoff unless the overshooting is quite extensive. Interestingly, if sufficient overshooting is assumed in order to match the main-sequence data, it is not possible to reproduce the cluster's extended giant branch unless the cluster age is at least 1.6 Gyr (assuming a metallicity in the range $-0.2 \leq$ [Fe/H] ≤ 0.0). This, in turn, requires that the cluster have an apparent distance modulus $(m-M)_V \leq 12.2$. Thus, sometime within the past few hundred million years, the ignition of helium burning in NGC 7789 has switched from a quiescent to an explosive ("flash") phenomenon, and the length of the cluster's red-giant branch has been steadily increasing with the passage of time since then. From main-sequence fits to models that have been carefully normalized to the Sun, we infer a reddening $0.35 \leq E(V-I) \leq 0.38$.

Subject headings: open clusters and associations: individual (NGC 7789) — stars: evolution

1. INTRODUCTION

The intermediate-age open cluster NGC 7789 [$\alpha(1950) = 23^h54\overset{\text{m}}{.}5$, $\delta(1950) = 56^\circ\ 27'$; $l = 115\overset{\circ}{.}49$, $b = -5\overset{\circ}{.}36$] has been the subject of numerous observational and theoretical studies since Burbidge & Sandage (1958) obtained photoelectric and photographic UBV photometry for about 700 stars within $\sim 450''$ of the cluster center. Their color-magnitude diagram (CMD), which reached as faint as $V = 16.3$ (~ 2.5 mag below the top of its main sequence), shows a well-defined and extended red-giant branch (RGB), a prominent "clump" of core He-burning stars, many blue stragglers, and a main sequence whose top end bends significantly to the red. Although the foreground reddening is fairly high, with estimates ranging from $E(B-V) = 0.23$ (Arp 1962) to 0.32 (Strom & Strom 1970), it appears to be reasonably uniform across the face of the cluster, judging from the tightness of the observed main sequence in, especially, the recent CCD CMD by Jahn et al. (1995). As indicated in Table 1, which also summarizes the available $E(B-V)$ and distance determinations, the metallicity of NGC 7789 appears to be slightly less than solar.

An extensive proper-motion membership analysis of NGC 7789 was carried out by McNamara & Solomon (1981), who identified 679 probable members brighter than $B \approx 15.5$ ($M_V \sim 2.1$). Radial-velocity measurements by Thogersen et al. (1993), Scott et al. (1995), and Gim et al. (1998; Paper I) have pretty well established which of the giants are cluster members. In addition, there have been many investigations to ascertain the membership status of the blue straggler candidates — using proper motions (Pendl 1975; McNamara & Solomon 1981), radial velocities (Strom & Strom 1970; Stryker & Hrivnak 1984; Drilling & Schönberner 1987; Manteiga et al. 1989; Milone & Latham 1994), or polarization data (Breger 1982). We review the results of all of these investigations in section 3.

The fact that NGC 7789 is a very populous cluster gives it considerable potential to test stellar models (simply because its principal photometric sequences on the CMD are

very well defined). The curvature of the upper main-sequence and the lack of significant numbers of subgiants is suggestive of convective core overshooting (Mazzei & Pigatto 1988), though Martinez Roger et al. (1994) have argued in favor of classical, non-overshooting models. However, none of the attempts (to date) to fit isochrones to the observed CMD are very convincing. On the one hand, Mazzei & Pigatto conclude that the age of NGC 7789 is 1.1 Gyr, but the isochrone for that age seems too bright in the vicinity of the turnoff and it fails to reproduce the cluster's extended RGB. On the other hand, the non-overshooting isochrones employed by Martinez Roger et al. have a morphology in the vicinity of the turnoff that is not at all like that observed. Even though they find a similar age (1.2 Gyr), their adopted distance modulus differs from the value assumed by Mazzei & Pigatto by nearly 0.5 mag.

On the observational side, too, further work is warranted. For no more than a small fraction of the cluster has a CMD been constructed. In the best available CMD (Jahn et al. 1995) the smaller number of stars only allows the main sequence to be clearly identified to $V \approx 19$ ($M_V \sim 6.5$) even though the limiting magnitude reaches $V \approx 20$. Much more extensive photometric coverage could be expected to reveal more giants, perhaps extending the RGB to redder colors, and a deeper survey would delineate the lower main sequence to much fainter magnitudes, thereby offering stronger constraints on stellar models and facilitating comparisons with the CMDs of other clusters having similar metallicities. It is for these reasons, and to revisit the question as to whether models with, or without, convective overshooting are better able to explain the observations, that we have undertaken this investigation.

Our photometry and its reduction are discussed in the section 2, the interpretation of the data using up-to-date stellar evolutionary tracks and isochrones is contained in section 4, and a brief summary of the main results of this investigation is given in section 5.

2. OBSERVATIONS and PHOTOMETRY

2.1. Observations

Observations for this project were made at the f/5 modified Newtonian focus of the Dominion Astrophysical Observatory (DAO) 1.8 m Plaskett telescope, by Zurek with the Tek-2 CCD on the nights of 1993 October 10/11, 15/16, and December 16/17, and by Gim with the SITe-1 CCD on 1995 October 31/November 1, November 1/2, December 5/6, 6/7, and 8/9. Each detector contains 1024 × 1024 pixels at a scale of 0.53 arcsec per pixel, yielding a 9 × 9 arcmin^2 image size. The gain and readout noise were 4.0 e$^-$/ADU and 11 e$^-$ for the Tek-2 CCD and 4.7 e$^-$/ADU and 13 e$^-$ for the SITe-1 CCD detector. A Johnson V, I filter set was used.

Figs. 1a and 1b shows the area observed in this study: Gim (1998) provides a full journal of the cluster and standard star observations. We used a total of 316 frames, among which 66 (33 frames each in V and I) were exposed for 600 s, 74 (37 frames each in V and I) for 60 s and 76 (38 frames each in V and I) for 6 s. An additional ten frames had 10 s exposures in V. There was considerable frame-to-frame overlap among adjacent fields. The diameter of the total cluster area covered was roughly 35 arcmin. The full-width at half-maximum (FWHM) of the stellar image cores ranges from $2\farcs2$ to $3\farcs2$ except those taken on 1995 December 7, for which the FWHM is about $4\farcs0$ because telescope tracking problems and strong winds resulted in elongated star images on some frames. Primary standard stars were taken from Landolt's *UBVRI* standard stars (Landolt 1992 and Stetson 1997) and also from stars in the globular cluster NGC 7006 (Davis 1992 and Stetson 1997) and the open cluster M 67 (Montgomery et al. 1993).

2.2. Photometry

All of the CCD image frames were subjected to two preprocessing steps, bias subtraction and flat fielding, in order to remove the instrumental signature; this was done with IRAF[2]. After the raw images from a given night were corrected for the floating bias level based on the overscan region and after they were properly trimmed, about 10 bias frames were median-combined into one bias-pattern frame, which was then subtracted from the raw images. During the various observing runs, mostly dusk and dawn sky flat frames were recorded, but on one night flat-field images were obtained by observing the undersides of clouds. All frames were divided by the median-combined flat frames for each filter on each night to remove pixel-to-pixel sensitivity variations.

All photometric reductions and analysis following the above preprocessing were accomplished by automatic profile-fitting techniques: DAOPHOT, ALLSTAR (Stetson 1987) and ALLFRAME (Stetson 1994) following the detailed explanations given in the *DAOPHOT II USER's Manual* and Stetson (1987). The approximate fitting function for the PSF was decided automatically for each frame as one of six different analytic models; tabulated sub-pixel corrections from the analytic model to the true empirical PSF were allowed to vary linearly with position in the frames. One comprehensive star list with a unique coordinate system is required before running ALLFRAME. However, it is not easy to match up all star lists from all frames, which are partially overlapped but greatly spread out in order to have greater areal coverage. Therefore, a set of plates of NGC 7789 from the Mount Wilson 100-inch Hooker telescope measured on the DAO PDS machine was used to provide a single coordinate system spanning the full area of the cluster, to which the CCD images could

[2]IRAF is distributed by the National Optical Astronomy Observatories, which are operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., under contract with the National Science Foundation.

be individually referred. The program DAOMASTER was used to estimate the individual geometric transformation equations relating the coordinate systems of the various frames to make the composite starlist for input to ALLFRAME. ALLFRAME derives a self-consistent set of positions and magnitudes for all detected star-like objects in an area of sky by using the geometric and photometric information from all images of a given field. Aperture corrections to place the relative PSF magnitudes derived from a given image on a repeatable absolute scale were determined by synthetic-aperture measurements of the same stars used for defining the PSFs. We employed apertures ranging from small (3 pixels) to large radii (25 pixels) on copies of the frames where all stars except the selected stars had been digitally subtracted.

2.3. Standardisation

We have chosen Landolt's (1992) observations as the basis of our standard system. However, to improve the internal homogeneity and precision of our results, we have combined our own measurements of Landolt's stars over the course of 15 years with his published data, producing refined magnitudes and colors which retain the overall zero points and color scales of the Landolt system, but with better precision and internal consistency. Two other primary standard fields are used in our calibrations: 28 stars in the open cluster M67 (Montgomery et al. 1993) and 124 stars in the globular cluster NGC 7006 (Davis 1992; Stetson 1997), Both photometric systems are also closely tied to Landolt's.

Instrumental magnitudes for all detected stars were transformed to the standard V and I magnitudes using the relations

$$v = V + a_0 + a_1(V - I) + a_2(X - 1.25) + a_3T, \tag{1}$$

$$i = I + b_0 + b_1(V - I) + b_2(X - 1.25) + b_3T, \tag{2}$$

where v, i are the instrumental magnitudes in the V and I filters, respectively, X is the airmass, and T is the time of the observation (the terms in T allow for the zero-order effects of any extinction variations during the night); the a_i, b_i are unknown transformation coefficients. For three photometric nights in 1995, all the above coefficients were determined from the primary standard stars; Table 2 contains our derived values for the color-dependent coefficients a_1 and b_1 and Table 3 for the other corresponding values. We defined a local standard sequence in the field of NGC 7789 based on the above transformations for the photometric nights. These local stars were then added to the standard list to improve the photometric tie-in among the three photometric nights, and also to determine the photometric zero points for individual frames obtained on non-photometric nights. The standard stars were mostly observed at airmasses larger than 1.2: for most of the NGC 7789 frames the airmasses were less than 1.1, though a significant number had higher airmasses (up to 1.6).

Figure 2 shows the residuals (in the sense of *present – standard*) in V and $(V-I)$ as functions of apparent magnitude and color for the primary standard stars. The offset and the standard error of the mean offset in V and $(V-I)$ based on 274 stars are -0.0024 ± 0.0009; s.d. $= 0.025$ and -0.0019 ± 0.0014; s.d. $= 0.030$, respectively.

2.4. Comparison with other photometry for NGC 7789

In order to check the reliability of the calibration, our V magnitudes for NGC 7789 stars were compared with six previous sets of photoelectric UBV photometry (Burbidge & Sandage 1958; Janes 1977; Breger 1982; Coleman 1982; Jennens & Helfer 1975; Breger & Wheeler 1980), two sets of photographic BV photometry (Burbidge & Sandage 1958; McNamara 1980), and CCD photometry in BV by Jahn et al (1995). The comparisons were made only for V because no I-band photometry has previously been published. The differences in V magnitude, in the sense of (*present – published*), as functions of V magnitude

and $(V-I)$ color are shown in Figs. 3a, 3b and 3c. Table 4 shows the mean offset and slope in the three plots.

The mean and standard deviation of the magnitude residuals indicate that the offset between our CCD photometry and the previous photoelectric photometry in Fig. 3a is negligible, +0.003 mag (30 stars) and −0.006 mag (18 stars), but the standard deviations, 0.035 mag and 0.033 mag, are appreciable. The comparison with previous photographic photometry (Fig. 3b) shows significant offsets: $\Delta V = 0.053$ mag (284 stars) and 0.018 mag (62 stars) with standard deviations of 0.045 mag and 0.061 mag, respectively. In addition, a systematic trend in V magnitude with the $(V-I)$ colors was found in comparison with both photoelectric and photographic photometry in the sense that our CCD photometry is brighter than published photometry for the bluer stars, with a slope of 0.032 to 0.068. In contrast, a comparison (Fig. 3c) with other CCD photometry (Jahn et al. 1995) appears to reveal a slight zero point shift of about 0.021 mag, but no systematic trend with color.

3. The CMD

Figure 4 shows the CMD for all 15617 stars with < 0.1 mag errors in the measured colors that were detected at least twice on both the V and I frames[3]. Photometry was obtained for 5915 additional stars, but they are not used in the following analysis because of their relatively large errors ($\sigma(V-I) \geq 0.1$ mag) or because they had only one detection in either V or I. The stars rejected by one of these criteria are plotted in Figure 5, along with the cluster's main sequence fiducial fainter than $V = 14.0$. The latter is an eye-estimated,

[3]The photometry files are available in machine-readable format from the Canadian Astrophysical Data Center, Dominion Astrophysical Observatory. They are also available from J.-C. Mermilliod, who has added our observations into his open cluster data bank.

hand-drawn fit to the tight, well-defined lower main sequence population of NGC 7789 (see Fig. 4). When compared with Figure 4, Figure 5 indicates that our rejection criteria have not eliminated very many probable cluster members. Figure 6 shows the standard errors in V as function of V magnitude.

Our photometry covers a much larger area and extends to much fainter magnitudes than any previous survey. The CMD that we have obtained shows an extended giant branch, a resonably well-defined "clump", numerous blue straggler candidates (see below), and a main sequence that extends down to at least $V = 21$. There is no evidence of any gap in the vicinity of the turnoff, though the upper end of the main sequence bends well to the red. This is reminiscent of the CMDs recently obtained for e.g., NGC 2420 (Anthony-Twarog et al. 1990) and NGC 752 (Daniel et al. 1994), and indicates substantial convective core overshooting in the main-sequence phase (see, e.g., Demarque et al. 1994). Field-star contamination, particularly in the color range $1.0 < V - I < 1.5$, is quite severe.

Figures 7a and 7b summarize what we know about the cluster membership. According to McNamara & Solomon (1981), those stars which are plotted as *plus signs* have a proper-motion membership probability $P(\mu) \geq 80\%$. Based on radial-velocity measurements made between 1979 and 1996, Gim et al. (1998) have identified 78 giant-star members: these are plotted as *open circles*, or denoted by the letter "V" to indicate that they are possible radial-velocity variables. Concerning the blue straggler candidates, the evidence seems to be quite strong that at least 16 of them (the *open squares* in Fig. 7a and 7b) are members, according to our assessment (cf. Table 5) of the proper motion, radial velocity, photometric, and polarization work that has been done to date to determine the membership of 48 apparent blue stragglers in NGC 7789. As indicated in the final column of this table, the membership status of 13 of these stars was considered to be uncertain, so the actual number of *bone fide* blue stragglers could well be significantly greater than our estimate. Finally, it is worth noting

that Jahn et al. (1995) found one pulsating blue straggler and 15 short-period variables as the result of observing NGC 7789 over four consecutive nights.

4. Analysis of the NGC 7789 CMD

4.1. Comparison with the M67 CMD

As indicated in Table 1, the available metallicity estimates for NGC 7789 range from [Fe/H] ≈ -0.3 to 0.0 (solar), whether determined spectroscopically or photometrically. As the uncertainty in this quantity is quite large, making it difficult to choose which models should be compared with the photometry, it is clearly desirable to try to constrain this parameter more tightly. One way to do this is to compare, in an age- and reddening-independent way, our CMD for NGC 7789 with that of another open cluster having a similar metallicity. M 67 is an obvious choice for such a comparison cluster because it has a well-defined CMD on the $(V, V-I)$–plane (Montgomery et al. 1993) and because its metal abundance is very well determined at [Fe/H] ≈ -0.05: most recent determinations (e.g., Nissen et al. 1987; Hobbs & Thorburn 1991; Friel & Janes 1993) are within ± 0.05 dex of this estimate.

To carry through the analysis, let us assume that the stars in NGC 7789 have exactly the same chemical composition as those in M 67. If that is the case, and if we superpose the cluster CMDs in such a way as to force the core He-burning "clump" stars in both clusters to have the same mean magnitude and color, which one might naively expect, then their respective lower main sequence populations should also overlay one another. As shown in Figure 8, such a coincidence is not obtained: the lower main sequence of NGC 7789 is redder than that of M 67 (at a fixed magnitude), which indicates that either our assumption of a common metallicity is incorrect, or the clump stars in NGC 7789 have not been properly

fitted to those in M 67. The two clusters have quite different ages and, according to the predictions of stellar models, the NGC 7789 clump should be somewhat bluer and brighter than M 67's, if the stars in both clusters undergo comparable amounts of mass loss prior to the core He-burning phase[4]. Our ZAHB for solar abundances (see below) indicates, for instance, that a $1.6\,\mathcal{M}_{\odot}$ model is 0.17 mag brighter and 0.04 mag bluer (in $V-I$), than one for $1.2\,\mathcal{M}_{\odot}$.

Suppose we adopt these offsets in positioning the NGC 7789 clump relative to that of M 67 and then intercompare the lower main sequence fiducials of the two clusters. The result is Figure 9, and once again we find that the unevolved stars in NGC 7789 are redder than those of M 67 (at a fixed $V > 15$). [The slope of the theoretical ZAHB is predicted to be nearly the same as the slope of the lower main sequence; consequently, the change in V largely compensates for the change in $V-I$ (of the clump stars) and the relative main-sequence locations of the two clusters are not altered appreciably.] Thus, the clump stars in NGC 7789 *must* be significantly bluer and/or *fainter* than those in M 67. If the reverse were true, then the main sequence of NGC 7789 would be well separated from (and redder than) that of M 67, which would imply that the former has much greater than solar abundances of the chemical elements — something for which there is no observational support.

According to, e.g., Friel & Janes (1993) and Twarog et al. (1997), NGC 7789 is approximately 0.1 dex more metal-poor than M 67, which would suggest that NGC 7789 has [Fe/H] $\gtrsim -0.2$. However, the uncertainties are such that both clusters could have [Fe/H] ≈ 0.0, and since it is useful to explore how the interpretation of a given CMD depends on the assumed metallicity, models for both [Fe/H] $= 0.0$ and -0.2 will be compared with the observations.

---

[4]As shown by e.g., Demarque & Hirshfeld (1975), the zero-age horizontal branch (ZAHB) for stars more massive than $\approx 1.0\,\mathcal{M}_{\odot}$, runs from the lower right to the upper left on the C-M plane (in the direction of increasing mass).

4.2. Stellar Model Fits

For their study of NGC 6819, Rosvick & VandenBerg (1998) computed several sets of models for solar abundances: reference should be made to that study for a description of the evolutionary code that was used. Worth emphasizing is the fact that those models were carefully normalized to the Sun and that convective overshooting has been treated using a parameterized version of the Roxburgh (1989) criterion. To be specific, we have determined the radius of a convective core, r_{cc}, from the requirement that

$$\int_0^{r_1} \mathcal{F}_{\rm over}(L_{\rm rad} - L)\frac{1}{T^2}\frac{dT}{dr}dr + \int_{r_1}^{r_{cc}} (2 - \mathcal{F}_{\rm over})(L_{\rm rad} - L)\frac{1}{T^2}\frac{dT}{dr}dr = 0 \ ,$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over}$ is a parameter with allowed values in the range $0.0 < \mathcal{F}_{\rm over} \leq 1.0$, L is the total luminosity produced by nuclear reactions, $L_{\rm rad}$ is the radiative luminosity, and the other symbols have their usual meanings.[5] The radius r_1 is the classical radiative-convective boundary; i.e., the point where $\nabla_{\rm ad} = \nabla_{\rm rad}$ (and $L = L_{\rm rad}$). Because $L < L_{\rm rad}$ in the

[5] In its most general form, Roxburgh's (1989) criterion contains two integrals with limits from $r = 0$ to $r = r_{cc}$ — one which is equivalent to the above with $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over} = 1.0$, and the other which properly accounts for energy dissipation. Where the difference between these two integrals vanishes is the correct radiative-convective boundary. However, the second integral requires the solution of the full set of turbulent equations that applies to a convective core and, consequently, it is not easily evaluated (though see Canuto & Christensen-Dalsgaard 1998). The parameterized criterion that we have solved is, in contrast, extremely easy to evaluate and, although the "trial and error" approach must be used to determine which value of $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over}$ produces the most realistic models to fit to an observed CMD, the computational effort is still rather small. Although our *ad hoc* way of limiting the extent of convective overshooting does not add very much to the physics of convection, an evaluation of $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over}$ does provide some empirical information on the relative importance of the dissipation term.

overshooting region ($r_1 < r \leq r_{cc}$) *and* because the dissipation is always positive, consistency demands that the factor $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over}$ in the first integral be replaced by the factor $(2 - \mathcal{F}_{\rm over})$ in the second integral. Setting $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over} = 1.0$ clearly recovers the integral equation that applies when viscous dissipation is neglected altogether (see Roxburgh's paper): this case corresponds to the maximum possible amount of overshooting. The minimum size of a convective core is obtained when the radiative-convective boundary is determined from the Schwarzschild criterion. (In what follows, the non-overshooting calculations are labelled "$\mathcal{F}_{\rm over} = 0.0$" even though, in this special case, the overshooting subroutine is bypassed.)

One goal of this investigation is to determine which value of $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over}$ leads to the best agreement between theoretical models and the observed CMD of NGC 7789. Knowing this will provide a valuable calibration point for the variation of this parameter with mass (and possibly [Fe/H]), which we hope to derive from similar considerations of other open clusters that encompass a wide range in age and metal abundance. But the distance scale is an important ingredient in such analyses. In a highly-reddened cluster like NGC 7789, it is arguably the best approach to infer the distance modulus from the magnitude of the clump stars. Based on published observations for many open clusters, Twarog et al. (1997) have suggested that "over the age range from NGC 7789 to Mel 66 (approximately 1 to 5 Gyr), the mean M_V is 0.6 ± 0.1". Since the mean magnitude of the clump in NGC 7789 is $V = 13.0 \pm 0.05$ mag (see Figs. 7a and 7b), the Twarog et al. M_V estimate implies that the apparent distance modulus of NGC 7789 is close to 12.40 mag. The reddening then follows from the requirement that the predicted zero-age main sequence, which is independent of whether or not overshooting occurs, match the observed main sequence for the unevolved stars, i.e., those fainter than $M_V \sim 4$. (Deriving this quantity from a main-sequence fit to stellar models should be especially reliable because the theoretical calculations have been normalized to the Sun: we assume $M_{V,\odot} = 4.84$, $(B-V)_\odot = 0.64$, and $(V-I)_\odot = 0.72$).

Figures 10a and 10b illustrate fits of evolutionary tracks for $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over} = 0.0$ and 1.0, respectively, to the NGC 7789 CMD assuming $(m-M)_V = 12.40$ and $E(V-I) = 0.38$. The tracks are the same as those used by Rosvick & VandenBerg (1998) in their analysis of NGC 6819 BV photometry, though we have extended those grids to include evolutionary sequences for 1.8 and $1.9\,\mathcal{M}_\odot$ stars. It is immediately apparent that neither set of models correctly predicts the observed TAMS ("terminal age main sequence"). The predicted TAMS, which is indicated by the nearly vertical *solid* curve connecting the red end of the hook feature, is either much too blue, in the case of the non-overshooting models, or somewhat too red, in the case of the models for $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over} = 1.0$: this is in comparison with the observed location of the bright end of the cluster main sequence. An intermediate amount of overshooting is clearly indicated and, as shown in Figure 11, models that assume $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over} = 0.5$ provide quite a good match to the observed TAMS.

The tracks for masses from 1.1 to $1.9\,\mathcal{M}_\odot$ were extended to include the giant-branch phase and, using a modified version of the Bergbusch & VandenBerg (1992) interpolation code (see Bergbusch & VandenBerg 1998), isochrones were produced for a suitable range in age. Interestingly, the calculations revealed that, for masses $\gtrsim 1.8\,\mathcal{M}_\odot$, the RGB tip magnitudes decrease rapidly with increasing mass. For instance, the giant-branch tip for a $1.9\,\mathcal{M}_\odot$ star is predicted to be $\Delta M_{bol} \approx 0.7$ mag less luminous than that for a $1.8\,\mathcal{M}_\odot$ star. This fairly abrupt decrease in the tip magnitude, and hence in the length of the RGB, signals the approach to the transition mass between quiescent and violent helium ignition (the so-called "helium flash"). In the case of non-overshooting models (see, e.g., Sweigart et al. 1989), this transition occurs near $2.3\,\mathcal{M}_\odot$. However, it is one of the well-known consequences of convective overshooting on the main sequence (see Bertelli et al. 1986, and references therein) that the lower mass limit for quiescent helium ignition is reduced (to $\approx 2.0\,\mathcal{M}_\odot$ for our $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over} = 0.5$ models). Thus, whether or not an intermediate-age cluster shows an extended giant branch provides a useful constraint on its distance and age (or on

the importance of convective overshooting), as was first pointed out by Barbaro & Pigatto (1984).

Indeed, this turns out to be an important consideration in the present analysis. Figure 12 illustrates the superposition of a 1.5 Gyr isochrone onto the NGC 7789 photometry, on the assumption of the same distance modulus and reddening that were adopted in the previous three figures. This is clearly not a "best-fit" isochrone as it is readily apparent that one for a slightly younger age is needed to fit the turnoff observations. However, besides being too red, the predicted giant branch at an age of 1.5 Gyr is not quite as extended as it needs to be to match the observed RGB, and that for any younger age (higher turnoff mass) will be even stubbier. Thus, in order for our overshooting models to match both the turnoff morphology *and* the well-developed giant branch possessed by NGC 7789, we are forced to conclude that the cluster distance modulus must be less than $(m - M)_V = 12.40$.

A more favorable comparison between the solar-abundance models and the NGC 7789 CMD is obtained if $(m - M)_V = 12.20$. This is illustrated in Figure 13, which indicates that a value of $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over} = 0.5$ still provides a good fit to the observed TAMS, and in Figure 14, which shows that a 1.6 Gyr isochrone faithfully reproduces the cluster's main sequence and RGB fiducials. However, the comparison between theory and observations is still not completely free of difficulty. For the first time in this analysis, we have superposed a theoretical ZAHB locus on the photometry and its location relative to that of the core He-burning stars seems problematic. This ZAHB consists of a sequence of 29 models having the same helium core mass, $\mathcal{M}_c$, but a range in total mass from $0.50\,\mathcal{M}_\odot$, at the blue end, to $1.8\,\mathcal{M}_\odot$, at the bright end past the red "nose". If no mass is lost in the precursor evolutionary phases, the clump stars should populate the bright end of the ZAHB: mass-losing stars should be fainter and redder than this point, eventually becoming bluer again if the mass loss has been severe. But there are many stars lying along the extension of the ZAHB to bluer colors and brighter

magnitudes.

The same "anomaly" was found by Rosvick & VandenBerg (1998) in the case of the $\sim$ 2.4 Gyr open cluster NGC 6819. They suggested that the brightest of the clump stars might be the descendants of blue stragglers, given that there is a confirmed blue straggler population in that cluster. NGC 7789 also contains significant numbers of such stars (see Figs. 7a and 7b) and one cannot help but speculate that their progeny might lie along the extension of the ZAHB to higher mass (if blue stragglers are significantly more massive than the cluster turnoff stars). However, there appears to be too many excessively bright clump stars for this to be the entire explanation.

We may, of course, be placing too much reliance on the accuracy of the ZAHB models. The reader will notice that the flat part of the ZAHB is very faint. This is for the reason that the predicted core mass in the overshooting models, particularly when the total stellar mass approaches the transition mass, is much lower than the values found in non-overshooting models. For instance, a $1.7\,\mathcal{M}_{\odot}$ star having solar abundances is predicted to have $\mathcal{M}_c = 0.4659\mathcal{M}_{\odot}$ if $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over} = 0.0$ (no overshooting) versus $0.4358\,\mathcal{M}_{\odot}$ if $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over} = 0.5$. This reduction in the core mass causes a decrease of ≈ 0.3 mag in the luminosity of the ZAHB. Thus, in all clusters whose upper main-sequence stars burn hydrogen in convective cores, the theoretical ZAHB locus depends quite sensitively on the amount of core overshooting which is assumed to occur in the main-sequence phase. This is clearly an important complication in the interpretation of star cluster CMDs, particularly if $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over}$ varies with mass.

But, regardless of whether or not the ZAHB in Fig. 14 is somewhat too faint (due, perhaps, to a problem with the models), there also seems to be a bit of a mismatch between the predicted and observed colors of the clump stars. While it is always very risky to try to draw conclusions from color information, the assumption of a constant reddening may be partly responsible. As Twarog et al. (1997; see references therein) have noted, when the

reddening is substantial, a red giant will exhibit a smaller $E(B-V)$ than a hotter main-sequence star if both are obscured by the same dust layer. They suggest that the reddening correction applied to the NGC 7789 giants should be about 0.03 mag smaller than the value applied to its turnoff stars. Such a differential correction would go in the right direction to improve the agreement between the models and the observed clump (while worsening slightly the fit to the brightest giants).

Reasonably good fits of isochrones to the NGC 7789 CMD can be obtained on the assumption of smaller distances, with consequent modest increases in the inferred age — e.g., 1.9 Gyr if $(m-M)_V = 11.9$ — but, if the apparent distance modulus is less than 12.0, then the predicted giant branch is well to the blue of its observational counterpart. The main argument that we can offer against the possibility that such discrepancies are due to inadequacies in the adopted color transformations, is that the same models produce a superb match to the CMD of NGC 6819 (see Rosvick & VandenBerg 1998), which is only 0.6–0.9 Gyr older than NGC 7789. Pending further developments, we therefore believe that Fig. 14 portrays the best interpretation of the NGC 7789 photometry *if* this cluster has the same chemical composition as the Sun.

Two additional points can be made in support of the basic cluster parameters that we have derived. First, given that $E(V-I) = 1.25E(B-V)$ (Bessell & Brett, 1988), the reddening value that was inferred from a main-sequence fit to stellar models—namely $E(V-I) = 0.35$—corresponds to $E(B-V) = 0.28$. This is very close to the mean of the $E(B-V)$ values listed in Table 1. And second, if we adopt $A_V = 3.1E(B-V)$ and $A_I = 1.98E(B-V)$ (Bessell 1998), then the adopted apparent distance modulus in V, i.e., $(m-M)_V = 12.20$, translates to $(m-M)_I = 11.88$. As illustrated in Figure 15, the quality of the resultant isochrone fit on the $[M_I, (V-I)_0]$-plane is quite comparable to that obtained on the $[M_V, (V-I)_0]$-plane (Fig. 14). But the main point to be noted here is that the mean

clump magnitude is essentially identical with the value $M_I = -0.23 \pm 0.03$ that is obtained from a volume-limited sample of more than 200 clump stars observed with *Hipparcos* (see, e.g. Stanek & Garnavich 1998).

We now turn to the possibility that it has [Fe/H] = −0.2, which is more consistent with the available metallicity determinations. By adopting various choices for the apparent distance modulus and examining the best-fit isochrone for that distance, it quickly became evident that $(m-M)_V$ had to be $\lesssim 12.15$ in order for the giant branch of the corresponding isochrone to be at least as long as the observed one. The isochrone fit that we obtained to the NGC 7789 photometry on the assumption of this distance upper-limit is shown in Figure 16: the inferred age is 1.7 Gyr. Except for the giant branch, the fit is quite comparable to that given in Fig. 14. If anything, the predicted ZAHB magnitudes agree slightly better with those of the observed clump, though a modest color offset (0.05 mag, say) remains. As before, a value of $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over} = 0.5$ yields good agreement between the predicted and observed TAMS. (This is sufficiently clear in Fig. 16 that we decided not to include a plot, like Fig. 13, which compares evolutionary tracks with the observed CMD.)

Because of the giant branch discrepancy, it is tempting to conclude that [Fe/H] = −0.2 is too low. Obviously, much more work is needed to better establish the reliability of the models before such an inference could be taken seriously, though, in support of this possibility, we note that Twarog et al. (1997) recently derived [Fe/H] = −0.08 from DDO photometry. What is fortunate is that the derived value of $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over}$ as well as the inferred distance and age are only weakly dependent on the cluster metallicity. Thus, regardless of which value of [Fe/H], in the range $-0.2 \leq$ [Fe/H] ≤ 0.0, applies to NGC 7789, it seems clear that the models must assume a value of $\mathcal{F}_{\rm over}$ close to 0.5 in order to match the observed CMD in the vicinity of the turnoff, that the cluster distance is approximately $(m-M)_V = 12.2$, and that the age of NGC 7789 is 1.6 – 1.7 Gyr.

5. Conclusion

We have presented extensive CCD photometry in V and I for the open cluster NGC 7789 that establishes its fiducial sequences on the $(V, V-I)$–plane down to $V \sim 21$ ($M_V \sim 9$). Despite the relatively high $E(V-I) \approx 0.35$, these sequences are very tight and well-defined, indicating that the reddening is nearly constant across the face of the cluster. A confrontation of these data with modern stellar evolutionary models has demonstrated, beyond any doubt, that significant convective core overshooting must occur in the main sequence phase. Non-overshooting models are unable to match either the observed morphology in the vicinity of the turnoff or the location of the TAMS relative to that of the main sequence. Perhaps the most novel aspect of our analysis is that the length of the red-giant branch has been used to set a lower limit to the cluster age (1.6 Gyr) and an upper limit to its distance [$(m-M)_V = 12.2$]. An important, well-known consequence of convective core overshooting is to reduce the maximum mass of stars that undergo the helium flash: above this limit, helium-burning is ignited quiescently and extended giant branches are not produced. As NGC 7789 has a well-developed, but not fully extended RGB, its giants must be just slightly below the lower mass limit where non-violent ignition of helium takes place.

This paper is the second in a loosely-connected series (the first was the study of NGC 6819 by Rosvick & VandenBerg 1998) to calibrate the dependence of the extent of overshooting on turnoff mass (and possibly metal abundance). As soon as that calibration is completed, a new grid of evolutionary tracks and isochrones will be computed (by D.A.V.) for application to intermediate-age stellar populations[6].

We thank an anonymous refree for a thoughtful and helpful report and Pat Dowler for

[6]In the meantime, the models used in both this investigation and that by Rosvick & VandenBerg may be obtained by e-mailing a request for them to D.A.V.

making available the overshooting subroutine that he developed as part of his M.Sc. thesis research. NSERC is acknowledged for a grant to P.B.S. and J.E.H. that provided support for M.G. This work was also partially supported by an NSERC Operating Grant to D.A.V.

REFERENCES

Anthony-Twarog, B.J., Kaluzny, J., Shara, M.M., & Twarog, B.A. 1990, AJ, 99, 1504

Arp, H. 1962, ApJ, 136, 66

Barbaro, G., & Pigatto, L. 1984, A&A, 136, 355

Bergbusch, P.A., & VandenBerg, D.A. 1992, ApJS, 81, 163

Bergbusch, P.A., & VandenBerg, D.A. 1998, in preparation

Bertelli, G., Bressan, A., Chiosi, C., & Angerer, K. 1986, A&AS, 66, 191

Bessell, M.S. 1998, private communication

Bessell, M.S., & Brett, J.M. 1988, pasp, 100, 1134

Breger, M., & Wheeler, J.C. 1980, PASP, 92, 514

Breger, M. 1982, ApJ, 263, 199

Burbidge, E.M., & Sandage, A. 1958, ApJ, 128, 174

Canterna, R., Geisler, D., Harris, H.C., Olszewski, E., & Schommer, R. 1986, AJ, 92, 79

Canuto, V.M., & Christensen-Dalsgaard, J. 1998, Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech. 30, 167

Clariá, J.J. 1979, Ap&SS, 66, 201

Coleman, L.A. 1982, AJ, 87, 369

Daniel, S.A., Latham, D.W., Mathieu, R.D., & Twarog, B.A. 1994, PASP, 106, 281

Davis, L.E. 1992, private communication

Demarque, P., & Hirshfeld, A. 1975, ApJ, 202, 346

Demarque, P., Sarajedini, A., & Guo, X.-J. 1994, ApJ, 426, 165

Drilling, J.S., & Schönberner, D. 1987, in The Second Conference on Faint Blue Stars, IAU Coll. 95. ed. A.G.D. Philip, D.S. Hayes, & J.W. Liebert, L. Davis Press, p. 587

Friel, E.D., & Janes, K.A. 1993, A&A, 267, 75

Gim, M. 1998, M.Sc. Thesis, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C., Canada

Gim, M., Hesser, J.E., McClure, R.D., & Stetson, P.B. 1998, PASP, in press (Paper I)

Hobbs, L.M., & Thorburn, J.A. 1991, AJ, 102, 1070

Jahn, K., Kaluzny, J., & Ruciński, S.M. 1995, A&A, 295, 101

Janes, K.A. 1977, AJ, 82, 35

Jennens, P.A., & Helfer, H.L. 1975, MNRAS, 172, 681

Küstner, F. 1923, Bonner Veröff., No. 18

Landolt, A.U. 1992, AJ, 104, 340

Manteiga, M., Martinez Roger, C., & Pickles, A.J. 1989, Ap&SS, 156, 169

Manteiga, M., Martinez Roger, C., Morales, C. & Sabau, L. 1991, A&A, 251, 49

Martinez Roger, C., Paez, E., Castellani, V., & Straniero, O. 1994, A&A, 290, 62

Mazzei, P., & Pigatto, L. 1988, A&A, 193, 148

McNamara, B.J. 1980, PASP, 92, 682

McNamara, B.J., & Solomon, S. 1981, A&AS, 43, 337

Milone, A.A.E., & Latham, D.W. 1994, AJ, 108, 1828

Montgomery, K.A., Marschall, L.A., & Janes, K.A. 1993, AJ, 106, 181

Nissen, P.E., Twarog, B.A., & Crawford, D.L. 1987, AJ, 93, 634

Pendl, E.S. 1975, A&A, 41, 239

Pilachowski, C.A. 1985, PASP, 97, 801

Rosvick, J.M., & VandenBerg, D.A. 1998, AJ, 115, 1516

Roxburgh, I.W. 1978, A&A, 65, 281

Roxburgh, I.W. 1989, A&A, 211, 361

Scott, J.E., Friel, E.D., & Janes, K.A. 1995, AJ, 109, 1706

Stanek, K.Z. & Garnavich, P.M. 1998, ApJL, in press (astro-ph/p9802121)

Stetson, P.B. 1987, PASP, 99, 191

Stetson, P.B. 1994, PASP, 106, 250

Stetson, P.B. 1997, private communication

Strom, K.M., & Strom, S.E. 1970, ApJ, 162, 523

Stryker, L.L., & Hrivnak, B.J. 1984, ApJ, 278, 215

Sweigart, A.V., Greggio, L., & Renzini, A. 1989, ApJS, 69, 911

Thogersen, E.N., Friel, E.D., & Fallon, B.V. 1993, PASP, 105, 1253

Twarog, B.A., Ashman, K.M., & Anthony-Twarog, B.J. 1997, AJ, 114, 2556

Twarog, B.A., & Tyson, N. 1985, AJ, 90, 1247

This manuscript was prepared with the AAS LaTeX macros v4.0.

Fig. 1a.— The area observed in the vicinity of NGC 7789. Note the approximate magnitude scale in the lower right-hand corner. Units on the horizontal and vertical axes are pixels, where 2048 pixels correspond to 9′.2. The center of the panel (4628, 3873) is nearly identical with the cluster center.

Fig. 1b.— Same as Fig. 1a, but indicates stars which are believed to be members (see section 3).

Fig. 2.— Residuals (in the sense of "present" − "standard") in V and $V - I$ as functions of apparent magnitude and color for the primary standard stars. *Crosses*: Landolt (1992) standards; *pluses*: Landolt stars (Stetson 1997); *open squares*: M 67 stars (Montgomery et al. 1993); *solid circles*: NGC 7006 stars (Davis 1992); and *open circles*: NGC 7006 stars (Stetson 1997).

Fig. 3a.— V magnitude comparison between our data and several published data sets obtained with photoelectric photometry. *Open circles*: Burbidge & Sandage (1958), *crosses*: Breger (1982), *squares*: Janes (1977), *solid triangles*: Coleman (1982), *open triangles*: Jennens & Helfer (1975), and *solid circles*: Breger & Wheeler (1980). Stars with large differences in the plot are M589 (one from Janes 1977 and the other from Jennens & Helfer 1975), M467 (Breger 1982) and M789 (Breger 1982). In addition, M292 (Breger 1982) and M864 (Janes 1977) have $|\Delta V| > 0.5$. V and $V - I$ on the horizontal axes are the magnitude and color from the present study. See Table 4 for a statistical summary of these plots.

Fig. 3b.— Same as Fig. 3a, but comparing the present data with published photographic photometry. *Crosses*: Burbidge & Sandage (1958), *open circles*: McNamara (1980). Four stars (M589, M1012, M818, and M717) from Burbidge & Sandage (1958) and three stars (M589, M1012, and M1054) from McNamara (1980) have $|\Delta V| > 0.5$.

Fig. 3c.— Same as Fig. 3a, but comparing the present data with published CCD photometry (Jahn et al. 1995). The total number of stars in this plot is 3030 including two stars with $|\Delta V| > 0.5$.

Fig. 4.— CMD for 15617 stars which were detected more than once in both V and I frames and also have $\sigma_{(V-I)} < 0.1$.

Fig. 5.— CMD for 5915 stars which are not used for the analysis because $\Delta(V-I) \geq 0.1$ or they were detected only once in either of the V or I frames. The solid line is the fiducial MS line which is obtained by eye fitting through the mean locus in Fig. 4.

Fig. 6.— The standard errors in V plotted as a function of V magnitude.

Fig. 7a.— A CMD which incorporates membership information for giant branch, blue straggler and upper-main sequence stars, as follows: *plus signs*: proper motion members (McNamara & Solomon 1981); *open circles* and *"V"*: radial velocity members including velocity variables (Gim et al. 1998); *open squares*: blue stragglers (see Table 5). *Dots* are stars for which no membership information other than their location in the CMD is available.

Fig. 7b.— Same as Fig. 7a, but for only those stars believed to be members. The clump star region is shown in the inset box with the expanded scale.

Fig. 8.— CMD of M67 (Montgomery et al. 1993) overplotted by the fiducial sequence for the NGC 7789 MS and its clump (*large cross*), which are shifted by $\Delta(V-I) = 0.25$ and $\Delta V = 2.45$. As shown in the inset box, these adjustments produce an approximate centering of the NGC 7789 clump onto that for M 67. The small *filled circles* represent the observed clump stars in M 67 while all other symbols represent NGC 7789 clump stars (see the previous figure).

Fig. 9.— As Fig. 8, but NGC 7789's data are shifted by Δ(V−I) = 0.29 and $\Delta V = 2.62$. As shown in the inset box, these offsets cause the M 67 clump stars to be redder and fainter, in the mean, than their counterparts in NGC 7789. This is approximately consistent with the expectations from theoretical ZAHB models for 1.2 and 1.6 $\mathcal{M}_\odot$ (which assumes some mass loss).

Fig. 10a.— Superposition of non-overshooting evolutionary tracks for 0.8 – 1.9 $\mathcal{M}_\odot$ onto the NGC 7789 CMD. (To highlight the comparison between theory and observations at the upper end of the main sequence, the plot has been restricted to $M_V \leq 5$: subsequent figures illustrate fits of models to the entire CMD.) The adopted reddening and distance modulus are as noted. The ZAMS and TAMS points on the tracks are connected by *thick solid curves*. The upper main-sequence population in NGC 7789 extends as far as the *dashed line*, which indicates our estimate of the location of the observed TAMS. Because the predicted and observed TAMS loci do not coincide, stellar models that neglect covective core overshooting are deemed inappropriate.

Fig. 10b.— As Fig. 10a, but for models with the maximum possible extent of overshooting according to the Roxburgh (1978, 1989) criterion. For the sake of clarity the dashed line in the previous figure has not been reproduced but it is obvious that the predicted TAMS again fails to match observed one, indicating (in this case) that too much convective overshooting has been assumed.

Fig. 11.— As Fig. 10b, but for models with an intermediate amount of overshooting according to the parameterized version of Roxburgh (1978, 1989) criterion that we have adopted. The predicted TAMS now reproduces the observed one quite well.

Fig. 12.— The CMD for NGC 7789 with an isochrone for 1.5 Gyr superimposed. While the match between theory and observations is generally good, the theoretical giant branch does not extend far enough to fit the observed red-giant branch.

Fig. 13.— NGC 7789 CMD on which evolutionary tracks for $0.7-1.9\,\mathcal{M}_{\odot}$ are superimposed. The adopted reddening and distance modulus are as noted. ZAMS and TAMS points are connected by thick solid curves. The models are calculated with an intermediate amount of overshooting and the TAMS agrees well with the observed one.

Fig. 14.— CMD for NGC 7789 with an isochrone for 1.6 Gyr superimposed, along with the corresponding theoretical ZAHB.

Fig. 15.— M_I versus $V-I$ CMD for NGC 7789 with an isochrone for 1.6 Gyr superimposed, along with the corresponding theoretical ZAHB.

Fig. 16.— CMD for NGC 7789 with a 1.7 Gyr isochrone for [Fe/H] $= -0.2$ superimposed.

This figure "fig1a.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig1b.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig2.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig3a.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig3b.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig3c.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig4.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig5.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig6.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig7a.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig7b.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig8.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig9.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

arXiv:astro-ph/9808117v1 12 Aug 1998

TABLE 1
REDDENING AND METALLICITY OF NGC 7789

E($B-V$)	[Fe/H]	$(m-M)_0$	Method	Ref
0.28	···	11.36±0.2	UBV Photometry	1
0.23	···	···	UBV Photometry	2
0.32	···	11.0±0.15	Spectral Type and *ubvy*	3
0.31±0.03	−0.35±0.10	11.37±0.3	UBV and *uvby*	4
···	−0.1±0.2	···	Spectroscopy (6 giants)	5
0.26	−0.2	11.5	$UBViyz$ (19 giants)	6
0.24±0.01	solar	11.5	DDO and UBV (22 giants)	7
0.22	−0.35	···	DDO and UBV (19 giants)	8
···	−0.05[a]	···	Washington system (3 giants)	9
0.32±0.03	···	11.3±0.02	CCD	10
···	−0.26±0.06	···	Spectroscopy	11

[a]Reported as [A/H]

REFERENCES.— (1) Burbidge & Sandage 1958; (2) Arp 1962; (3) Strom & Strom 1970; (4) Twarog & Tyson 1985; (5) Pilachowski 1985; (6) Jennens & Helfer 1975; (7) Janes 1977; (8) Clariá 1979; (9) Canterna et al. 1986; (10) Martinez Roger et al. 1994; (11) Friel & Janes 1993

arXiv:astro-ph/9808117v1 12 Aug 1998

TABLE 2
COLOR-DEPENDENT COEFFICIENTS (MEAN VALUES)

Date	Detector	V		I	
		a_1	σ	b_1	σ
1993	Tek-2	−0.0134	0.0042	−0.0405	0.0063
1995	SITe-1	−0.0108	0.0013	−0.0349	0.0026

arXiv:astro-ph/9808117v1 12 Aug 1998

TABLE 3
COLOR INDEPENDENT COEFFICIENTS (INDIVIDUAL VALUES)

Date	V				I			
	a_2	σ	a_3	σ	b_2	σ	b_3	σ
1/11/95	0.1840	0.0039	−0.0072	0.0002	0.0787	0.0068	−0.0091	0.0004
2/11/95	0.1790	0.0048	−0.0059	0.0003	0.0642	0.0049	−0.0114	0.0003
6/12/95	0.2118	0.0017	−0.0052	0.0001	0.0713	0.0028	−0.0068	0.0001

arXiv:astro-ph/9808117v1 12 Aug 1998

TABLE 4
Comparison with Published Photometry

References	No.[a]	ΔV vs. V Mean	ΔV vs. V s.d.	ΔV vs. $V-I$ Slope	Excluded Stars
Photoelectric photometry					
Burbidge & Sandage (1958)	30	0.003	0.035	0.041	
Breger (1982)	16	−0.051	0.014	···	M789, M467, M292
Janes (1977)	19	−0.006	0.033	0.041	M589, M864
Coleman (1982)	8	−0.016	0.037	···	···
Jennens & Helfer (1975)	16	−0.037	0.026	0.048	M589
Breger & Wheeler (1980)	1	···	···	···	···
Total	89	−0.017	0.038	0.028	···
Photographic photometry					
Burbidge & Sandage (1958)	284	0.053	0.045	0.032	11 stars with $\Delta V > 0.3$
McNamara (1980)	63	0.018	0.061	0.068	4 stars with $\Delta V > 0.2$
CCD photometry					
Jahn et al. (1995)	3030	0.021	0.071	0.005	

[a]Number of stars compared

arXiv:astro-ph/9808117v1 12 Aug 1998

TABLE 5

MEMBERSHIP OF BLUE STRAGGLERS IN NGC7789

	ID[a]		Proper Motion[b]		Radial Velocity [c]					Photometry [d]		$\mathcal{P}$ [e]	Adopted [f]
K	M	G	P	Mc	SS	SH	D	MRP	ML	TT	MMMS	B	
2	257	396	···	98	···	···	···	···	no	no	···	···	U
68	317	498	···	76	···	···	···	···	no	m	···	···	U
88	325	348	···	98	···	···	···	···	no	m	···	m	U
144	361	425	···	0	no	···	···	···	···	···	···	···	N
168	377	560	···	77	no	···	no	···	fr	m	···	u	U
192	389	479	···	52	···	···	···	···	fr	m	···	u	U
197	396	381	38	46	m	···	···	···	no	···	···	u	N
234	419	421	78	0	m	···	···	···	···	···	···	no	N
246	432	16	···	0	···	···	···	no(c)	···	···	no	no	N
282	460	114	91	97	···	m	m	m(v)	fr	m	m	m	M
316	482	549	93	98	···	···	m	···	m	···	···	m	M
325	489	1126	···	98	···	···	···	···	···	···	···	···	U
342	502	166	91	96	m	m	m	m	fr	m	···	m	M
349	500	404	92	0	m	···	···	···	···	···	···	no	N
351	514	447	92	0	···	···	···	···	···	···	···	no	N
371	518	277	83	98	no	m	m	m(c)	m	m	m	m	M
409	543	295	82	53	m	m	no	···	no	m	m	u	N
430	···	···	···	0	···	···	···	···	···	···	···	no	N
453	574	204	92	98	m	m	m	no(c)	fr	m	m	m	M
462	577	298	···	0	···	···	···	no	···	···	···	no	N
635	712	282	92	8	···	···	···	···	···	···	···	no	N
677	747	43	92	53	···	m	no	no(c)	no	m?	m	m	N
696	752	558	86	98	···	···	···	···	fr	m	···	m	M
746	789	231	92	98	···	···	m	···	m	m	···	m	M
758	803	17	···	0	···	···	···	···	···	···	···	no	N
799	817	76	···	0	no	···	···	no(c)	···	···	no	no	N
889	879	61	···	0	···	···	···	no(c)	···	···	no	no	N
906	893	191	···	0	···	···	···	···	···	···	···	no	N
934	913	311	···	78	···	···	···	···	no	m	···	u	N
1047	981	140	···	96	···	···	···	···	fr	···	m	u	M
1095	1011	589	91	98	···	···	···	···	m	···	···	m	M
1119	1026	255	92	0	···	···	···	···	···	···	···	u	N
1168	1054	534	54	95	m	···	m	···	m	m?	···	m	M
1208	1090	74	···	0	···	···	···	···	···	···	···	no	N
1211	1088	73	91	97	m	m	no	···	no	m	m	m	U
1270	1133	384	···	98	···	···	m	···	m	m	···	m	M
1288	1142	314	···	92	···	···	···	···	fr	m	···	···	M
1309	1161	39	···	0	···	···	···	···	···	···	···	no	N

TABLE 5—*Continued*

ID[a]			Proper Motion[b]		Radial Velocity [c]					Photometry [d]		$\mathcal{P}$ [e]	Adopted [f]
K	M	G	P	Mc	SS	SH	D	MRP	ML	TT	MMMS	B	
···	99	104	···	86	···	···	···	···	no	no	m	···	U
···	144	···	···	67	···	···	···	···	fr	m?	···	···	U
···	172	···	···	89	···	···	···	···	no	no	···	···	U
···	210	···	···	90	···	···	···	···	no	no	···	···	U
···	238	168	···	94	···	···	no	···	no	no	···	···	U
···	459	52	···	90	···	···	m	···	fr	m	m	···	M
···	511	29	···	98	···	···	no	···	fr	m	m	···	M
···	808	345	···	94	···	···	no	···	fr	m?	···	···	M
···	1060	23	···	97	···	···	no	···	fr	m?	···	···	M
···	1251	176	···	71	···	···	no	···	···	m	···	···	U

NOTE.—v: variable, c: constant, fr: fast rotator in the columns 9 and 10;
m: members, no: non-members, u and m?: stars with uncertain membership

[a]Identification: K (Küstner 1923), M (McNamara & Solomon 1981), G (GIM 1998)

[b]Membership probability by proper motion: P (Pendl 1975), Mc (McNamara 1980)

[c]Membership by radial velocity: SS (Strom & Strom 1970), SH (Stryker & Hrivnak 1984),
D (Drilling & Schönberner 1987), MRP (Manteiga et al. 1989), ML (Milone & Latham 1994)

[d]Photometry: TT (Twarog & Tyson 1985), MMMS (Manteiga et al. 1991)

[e]$\mathcal{P}$: Polarization : B (Breger 1982)

[f]Adopted membership: M (members), N (non-members), and U (stars with uncertain membership)

This figure "fig10a.gif" is available in "gif" format from:
http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig10b.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig11.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig12.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig13.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig14.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig15.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1

This figure "fig16.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9808117v1